

# Robust sustainable tourism and agriculture sectors in Niue supported by biodiversity mainstreaming and sustainable land management

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10769

**Countries**

Niue

**Project Name**

Robust sustainable tourism and agriculture sectors in Niue supported by biodiversity mainstreaming and sustainable land management

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

12/7/2022

**Review completed by PM**

6/7/2023

**Program Manager**

Sarah Wyatt

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF** ☐

**CEO Endorsement** ☐

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/13/2023

Yes.

2/27/2023

No, there are some elements of this project that are not eligible for funding under the biodiversity focal area strategy.

1.1.1 ? This activity is not eligible for support under the GEF biodiversity strategy. Specifically, it is not the GEF's role to support such an assessment especially on economic and social components. By the time the project actually starts, it should be well past the acute phase of the COVID pandemic. A forward looking planning and assessment exercise might be more appropriate. However, in any such planning, the GEF increment should be focused on reducing environmental impact and not broader subjects

#### Agency Response

Indeed, as the COVID situation has continued to ease, this output no longer appears necessary. It has been deleted accordingly. A single activity from 1.1.1, 'Guide the development of policies that mainstream biodiversity and SLM into the tourism and agriculture sectors and into Niue's broader strategy for green recovery', has been reworded slightly and has replaced former Activity 1.1.2.4 (now 1.1.1.4). (Refer to PD P.34; and CEO ER P.1 and 24)

#### Project description summary

### **2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/13/2023

No, output 1.1.1 in the portal has not been updated, it is unclear how the first indicator for component 1 relates to the environment, and it still says indicators and targets to be defined during PPG even though PPG already happened.

2/27/2023

No, issues have been raised below.

#### Agency Response

06/05/2023

All references to the original Output 1.1.1 ('Up-to-date and detailed assessment and projections of social, economic and environmental impacts / implications of COVID-19 pandemic on Niuean tourism and agriculture sectors, analysing associated risks and opportunities, and guiding long-term policies and procedures for environmental sustainability') have been removed and remaining outputs renumbered.

Indicator 1.1.1 has been revised and targets added

-----

Thanks. Revised as advised.

### **3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

### Agency Response

#### Co-financing

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2023

No, airport infrastructure is not eligible as co-financing. In fact, surfaces and lighting will likely have detrimental impacts on biodiversity. As for the agency co-financing, all the items mentioned are covered through the agency fee and are not co-financing and we hope additional resources can be found during implementation.

2/27/2023

No, please explain how the airport project is cofinancing. Also, we typically expect for an IA to mobilize some co-financing. In addition, please correct the text underneath to not talk about PPG in the future.

### Agency Response

06/05/2023

Airport infrastructure (\$5,136,800) has been removed from the cofinancing calculations. However, the cofinancing letter (#6) in question has not been removed, because it describes another grant, in the amount of \$733,125, also from NZAID, which remains valid.

UNEP will make every effort to identify agency cofinancing during project implementation.

-----

3/20/2023

As mentioned in the cofinancing letter, Niue's international airport provides an essential infrastructural link enabling tourism, with regular flights to / from New Zealand. Safety and security of this link requires investment in surfaces and lighting. A conservative figure of 25% of the total investment has been used to calculate cofinancing. UNEP as IA will provide oversight to project execution to ensure all GEF rules and regulations are adhered, and also coordinate the implementation of projects by organizing an inception meeting, participating

PSC meetings and reviewing technical outputs. TM will take missions as frequently as necessary. Currently, UNEP is trying to mobilize some co-financing. Text has been corrected. Finally, some errors have been corrected in Table 1C, causing the cofinancing amount to be revised upward, which change is reflected elsewhere in the documents. (Refer to PD P.1; and CEO ER Table 1C)

**GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/27/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/27/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2023

Yes, thank you.

2/27/2023

No, please include the METT score for the PA and the ExACT spreadsheet or other calculations for CO2. Also, please include GEBs related to sub-indicator 4.3, given the size of the LD allocation of the project.

In addition, if indigenous peoples are included in the project please include them in the taxonomy.

#### Agency Response

3/20/2023

METT scores and ExAct calculations have been included in Annex F. Complete analyses are included in Appendices 14 and 15 of the PD.

The previous version of the CEO doc. had assigned 2,800 ha to sub-indicator 3.1 and 0 ha to sub-indicator 4.3. This has now been corrected to show these 2,800 ha against 4.3, as per the PIF.

The indigenous people's box has been ticked in the Annex G taxonomy. (Refer to PD Appendices 14 and 15; and CEO ER Annex F and G)

#### Part II ? Project Justification

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/27/2023

Yes.

#### Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/6/2023

Yes.

#### Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/16/2023

Thank you for the extensive edits.

We remain concerned that the project is trying to undertake too many different activities (such as pre-feasibility studies for 3 different financing mechanisms and then begin implementation on them, 2.1.1.3 is a complicated process in and of itself, 2.1.4.2 could be a whole component). Completing something successfully is better than half completing many things. Please also consider that enforcement of regulations can often be challenging in small countries and communities where the enforcers may have close relationships with those receiving the enforcement.

Overall, given the experience of other countries in the region in undertaking projects with a diverse set of activities and, therefore, a need for a large number of different consultancies and the resulting delays and challenges, we would strongly encourage the project proponents to reconsider their approach and considering removing some activities. Has the project team adequately accounted for the time and human resources required to manage all these disparate activities including contracting processes?

3/6/2023

No. Overall, there seems to be confusion at points about outcomes, outputs, and activities. For example, 1.1.2.4 is more of an outcome than an activity. We're concerned that some of the activities described may not be feasible or haven't been considered for what they will require.

Please address the following issues:

1.1.5 ? Will there be support to actually remove the barriers identified?

1.1.6 ? In this activity and throughout the project, working with regional organizations should be emphasized. Niue's limited number of people (and accompanying capacities) means that establishing mechanisms and relationships are important for long term support. While various consultancies may be necessary, we would like to encourage working with SPREP, SPC, or other similar institutions as a first choice. Obviously hiring national or regional consultants is also preferred.

1.1.2.4 ? This is another activity that is an output at a minimum or should be described more concretely.

Component 2 ? This component would benefit from a close review of the theory of change for the specific activities identified ? the connection to biodiversity conservation is tenuous at points. USAID has done helpful work on conservation enterprise that would provide a good model for such an analysis. There are a wide variety of activities described under this component and often complicated and challenging endeavors are given just a single line of an activity. It is important to make sure that sufficient time, resources and focus are given to any set of activities to have real impact rather than a scattershot of capacity building and work that has little lasting result. We would encourage focusing on a smaller number of endeavors to ensure lasting impact.

2.1.1.3 ? How will the project support integrating these values into decision making and policy proposals rather than an abstract big number?

2.1.2 ? This seems to place a lot of faith in awareness raising as a solution to these problems. Is there support for implementation?

2.1.2.2 ? This activity is not eligible for GEF STAR resources. Please remove.

2.1.2.4 ? This has limited relation to biodiversity conservation and basically sounds like tourism product enhancement.

2.1.3.1 ? It is a bit odd to see FPIC separated out in this way. Will there be opportunities for communities to co-design or select activities?

2.1.3.6 ? This seems oddly phrased. Is this meant as a review of various practices to inform the other activities here?



2.1.4.3 ? The description of this is a bit fuzzy. However, it will be important to consider undesired or unintended consequences. For example, publicizing tapu areas could have the opposite effect of that which is intended as tourists will actually want to visit something ?forbidden?. In a number of cases with sensitive natural sites, locations are kept secret to avoid damage.

2.1.5 ? The activities described below seem to have very little relationship to certifications or what is in this output. Certifications are often rather challenging and expensive to implement and are not a financial solution. STAP has provided guidance on certifications and their advice would be good to incorporate if that is the direction the project would like to take. Where is agriculture in the activities? Please clarify.

2.1.5.1 ? Please clarify what this means.

2.1.5.2 ? This is another example where it is not an activity but more of an output. How will this be done?

2.1.5.3 ? The GEF can only support this work if these funds do not go to the general treasury but are ringfenced for PA management.

3.1.2 ? This seems like an awareness campaign covering most everything for everyone which seems hard to do effectively. It would be good to focus and make sure these are serving the other activities.

3.1.2.1 ? This is confusing and sounds circular. Please rephrase and focus without the assumption that change will happen simply with more information.

3.1.3 ? It is difficult to see the GEBs or the path to GEBs for this app. It is not the GEF's role to promote tourism. Good apps are likely significantly more expensive than what is budgeted here and require significant on-going maintenance. All of this especially true if there is the expectation that people will put in payment information. This should likely be removed from this project.

Agency Response  
06/05/2023

Following a careful review of all proposed activities, including those mentioned specifically in the review, the following activities were as lower priority and have been removed from the project workplan (numbering refers to previous draft) or had their scope reduced:

- ? 1.1.1.5
- ? 1.1.2.1
- ? 1.1.3.1
- ? 1.1.3.3
- ? 1.1.4.1
- ? 2.1.1.3
- ? 2.1.3.4
- ? 2.1.3.5
- ? 2.1.4.2 (reduced scope of (iii))
- ? 2.1.5.2 (reduced scope)
- ? 2.1.5.3 (reduced scope)

-----  
3/20/2023

These issues have been addressed, as described below.

Activity 1.1.4.3 (new number) will address identified barriers. It reads: ?Identify and implement policies and regulatory changes needed to remove barriers to implementation of selected financing options?. (Refer to PD P. 36 and CEO ER P. 26).

Output 1.1.5 (new number) now refers to SPREP, which will provide technical support here. (Refer to PD P.36, 37 and CEO ER P.26)

Wording of 1.1.1.4 (new number) has been revised to describe an activity rather than an output. (Refer to P.34, and CEO ER P.24)

Component 2 activities have been reviewed and revised as per changes shown below. (Refer to PD P.37-41; and CEO ER P.27-30)

The wording of Activity 2.1.1.3 has been revised to emphasize the issue of externalities, while Activity 1.1.1.4 has been revised to make explicit the connection between valuation, external costs and policy response. (Refer to PD P. 34, 38 and CEO ER P. 24 and 27)

Activity 2.1.2.2 (new number) has been revised to include reference to policy and regulatory requirements, which link to awareness (and enforcement) in order to deliver compliance. (Refer to PD p. 38; CEO ER p. 28)

Activity 2.1.2.2 (old number), related to preparation of a climate and disaster vulnerability assessment, has been deleted. (Refer to PD p. 38; CEO ER p. 28)

Activity 2.1.2.3 (new number) was envisaged primarily to engender pride amongst local communities in their own traditional knowledge systems of land and resource management and governance by raising the profile of these issues. Tourism provides an opportunity to do this and the benefit to the sector should be consider as a by-product (?win-win?). The wording of the activity has been slightly revised to focus on the communities? capacities. (Refer to PD, p. 39; CEO ER p. 28)

FPIC is no longer shown as an activity but instead is referenced within the Output 2.1 description. Community co-design is explicitly highlighted under Output 2.1.4 and is implied elsewhere, in conjunction with FPIC. (Refer to PD p. 40; CEO ER p. 27)

The wording of this activity (renumbered as 2.1.3.5) has been revised for clarity. Like Activity 2.1.2.3 above, this is meant to help revitalize key positive aspects of traditional land management systems and practices. (Refer to PD P.39 and 29)

The wording of Activity 2.1.4.3 has been revised to enhance clarity. The decision on how best to ensure protection of *tapu* areas has been deferred. (Refer to PD p. 40; CEO ER p. 29)

Following further consultation with government, it has been decided to remove the reference to certification and to focus on some of the financing solutions identified under this output. (Refer to PD p. 41; CEO ER p. 29, 60)

Agriculture is included in all three revised activities under Output 2.1.5. (Refer to PD p. 41; CEO ER p. 30)

Activities 2.1.5.1 ? 2.1.5.3 have been rewritten, in light of the comments. (Refer to PD p. 41; CEO ER P. 30)

The output and activity descriptions under Output 3.1.2 have been rephrased to clarify their focus. However, it also bears mentioning that the small size of the island and target population mean that an unusually large segment of the population can be reached by these and other activities. (Refer to PD p. 42 and CEO ER p. 31)

The wording of Activity 3.1.2.1 has been revised to eliminate the circularity. The output remains focused on awareness and education, while connecting to incentives elsewhere in the project. (Refer to PD p. 42 and CEO ER p. 31)

In order to maintain the project's focus and feasibility with available budget and to enhance emphasis on GEBs, Output 3.1.3 has been removed from the project. (Refer to PD p. 42 and CEO ER p. 31)

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/6/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/6/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/6/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/13/2023

Yes. The sustainability section is rather weak, but it will come down to the approach taken during implementation.

3/6/2023

No, given the particular challenges of Niue's small population in developing and maintaining capacities, please focus on this issue for sustainability.

Agency Response

3/20/2023

The issue of sustainability of capacity building has been elaborated in the sustainability section of the CEO doc. (Refer to CER ER. P.38)

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/13/2023

Yes.

3/6/2023

No, please include a map showing the areas where the project will work in the Portal.

#### Agency Response

3/20/2023

A more detailed map, including geo-referenced information, is provided in the relevant section of the CEO document and has also been uploaded. (Refer to CEO ER p.39 figure 6)

#### Child Project

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

#### Agency Response

##### Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/6/2023

Yes.

#### Agency Response

##### Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/6/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/6/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/13/2023

Yes.

3/4/2023

No, it seems unlikely that climate risks to the project are generally low. While the project may increase resilience, it is important to account for climate change impacts in the design and implementation plan. For example, how are adaptive management systems built in or timelines designed for the case of a cyclone?

Agency Response

3/20/2023

Two of the project's climate related risks are now identified as 'Moderate' and the importance of developing adaptive management strategies is highlighted. (Refer to PD p.48)

#### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2023

Yes.

3/6/2023

No, it would be good to talk about ongoing and past initiatives by FAO, UNDP, SPREP and others to learn from.

#### **Agency Response**

3/20/2023

A paragraph has been added to the section on implementation arrangements, emphasizing the roles of Niue's Project Management Coordination Unit and of SPREP in helping to ensure continuity with, and learning from, past implementation experience. (Refer to PD p.54, CEO-ER p.46)

#### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/5/2023

Yes.

#### **Agency Response**

#### **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed 'Knowledge Management Approach' for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/5/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2023

Yes.

3/5/2023

Yes. However, we would like to ensure that grievance mechanisms will seek to use traditional decision making and dispute resolution mechanisms first.

Agency Response

3/20/2023

A statement to this effect has been included in the description of the project's grievance mechanism. (Refer to PD Appendix 17)

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/5/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Benefits**



**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/5/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/14/2023

Yes, thank you for the quick response.

6/13/2023

No. Please address the following -

- Stakeholder engagement comment has mostly been addressed. However, agency has still not completed the last part of the section.
- 
- In the previous submission (attached in pdf format) Audits were not charged to M&E ? in this version, Audits are charged to M&E Budget plan and M&E in Budget Table. Per Guidelines, these have to be charged to PMC.
- While National Project Manager (NPM) is now charge to PMC and M&E, the TORs (page 102 of the attached word file) don?t do justice neither match the NPM?s tasks described in the M&E Budget table, which results in 47% of its salary being charged to M&E ? please ask the Agency to adjust.
- 

6/7/2023

No.

The extended cancellation deadline of this project is 6/15/2023. See our comments below:

1. Core indicators: please consider including the target for core indicator 1 in the results framework (annex a). Core indicators need to be explicitly mentioned in the results framework consistent with core indicators table.
2. Co-financing: the co-financing letters of support are dated in 2022. Please consider providing an updated estimation of the actual amount that the agency think will go to the project considering the timeframe for both ? the co-finance and the GEF project.
3. Gender: Please reflect how gender perspectives are integrated in the following outputs: 1.1.2; 1.1.5; 2.1.2; 2.1.3, 2.1.6, 3.1.1, 3.1.2. Please incorporate in the Portal as well.
4. Stakeholder Engagement: The project includes some information on the different roles of stakeholders during the project implementation. Information provided does not however include sufficient information regarding stakeholders who have been and will be engaged, means of engagement, dissemination of information, roles and responsibilities in ensuring effective Stakeholder Engagement, resource requirements, and timing of engagement throughout the project/ program cycle. Agency should in line with the GEF Policy on Stakeholder engagement provide addition information on the above. Also noted that the agency has not completed in the section the portal to ?select what role civil society will play in the project?.
5. Operations: Expected Completion Date is wrong, please ask the Agency to revise, so the implementation start and completion dates will account for 60 months.
6. Budget table:
  - i. National Project Manager is charged to both components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project?s execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Co-financing resources allocated to PMC are 1 million and nearly 13.5 million of total co-financing are represented in grants. Please review.
  - ii. M&E in the budget table is \$120,000 but under Section 9-M&E in the Portal entry, it is \$175,000. Please revise for consistency.
  - iii. Please add a column to indicate responsible entity for each project activity.
  - iv. Please upload an excel version of the budget to Portal.

Agency Response  
06/13/2023

**Stakeholder engagement:** A section on goal, timing and means of engagement has been added to Annex 17 and to the CEO ER, which describes the project approach in each of these areas, in line with the comments received (Refer to pages 140 and 141 in PD; page 42 in

CEO). Checkboxes indicating the role of Civil Society in the project have been added to the Stakeholder section of the CEO ER, which has been uploaded to the Portal.

**Audit:** Audits are now correctly shown under PMC rather than M&E. As a result, M&E costs have been reduced by \$20,000, a change which has been reflected in both the project budget and in the M&E summary table. Audit costs are covered under PMC and are no longer shown in the M&E table. Additional minor budgetary changes have had to be made as a result of this change (in order not to increase PMC, etc).

**NPM:** ToRs for the NPM have been revised in order to match up with the NPM's budgetary allocation under PMC and M&E (refer to Pages 52 and 53 in CEO; Pages 95 and 96 in PD). M&E tasks are now fully described in the NPM ToR, and technical tasks have been re-allocated within the team (refer to pages 104-108 in PD).

---

**06/05/2023**

1. Core indicator #1 was already in results framework as Indicator 2.1.3. Cross referencing to all core indicators has now been added to the results framework in both documents.

2. Nearly all of the cofinancing letters date from November and December of 2022. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that, due to delays in project approval / launch, the actual amount of cofinancing available during the project period may be reduced by 5-10%, or so. The project will endeavor to identify leveraged cofinancing for at least this amount.

3. This information was provided in Table 18.1 of the project document. A cross reference has been added to Section 3 of the CEO ER and the main columns of the table, showing mainstreaming of gender actions at the level of each project output, has been reproduced there for ease of reference.

4. Documentation regarding stakeholder engagement has been revised in the prodoc (Section 5 and Appendix 17) and in the CEO ER (Section 2, Stakeholders). Section in Portal re. role of civil society has been completed.

5. Implementation start date updated throughout submission docs. to November 2023, completion date is October 2028

6i. GEF-funded costs associated with the National Project Manager (NPM) are budgeted against PMC and M&E (the latter in correspondence with the M&E table ? see next comment). The NPM is no longer budgeted against Components 1, 2 or 3. Cofinancing will support management costs proportionately, as shown in Table IB of the CEO doc.

6ii. M&E costs have been carefully reviewed and now total \$185,000. This figure and individual allocations are now consistent across the budget and Section 9, Monitoring and Evaluation, in the CEO doc. In particular, M&E responsibilities assigned to the National Project Manager (NPM) are now budgeted accordingly.

6iii. A column has been added to indicate the responsible entity for each budget line.

6iv. An Excel version of the budget has been uploaded to the Portal.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/5/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/5/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2023

Yes.

3/5/2023

No, please provide better responses to the comments and how they were incorporated into the project. If there were difficulties or reasons that something didn't make sense, please include that information.

Agency Response

3/20/2023

Responses to all Secretariat and Council comments have been reviewed and strengthened.  
(Refer to CEO ER Annex B, p.59-60)

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2023

Yes.

3/5/2023

No, please include responses to STAP's comments in the Portal.

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/5/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/5/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/14/2023

Yes.

6/13/2023

No, please address the remaining issues.

5/16/2023

No, a few small issues remain to be addressed.

3/5/2023

No, we would be happy to discuss the project and support resolving some of the issues raised.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/6/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**